

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 16

STEVEN J. SHUMAKER SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A. 8425 SEASONS PARKWAY SUITE 105 ST. PAUL MN 55125

> COPY MAILED AUG 0 9 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Edge et al.

Application No. 09/778,515

Filed: 7 February, 2001

Atty Docket No. 10256US01

DECISION GRANTING

PETITION

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), filed on 23 June, 2004, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of priorfiled nonprovisional Application No. 09/631,312, filed on 3 August, 2000.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after 29 November, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

(1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted; 1

Any nonprovisional application or international application designated the United States of America claiming the benefit of one or more prior-filed copending applications or international applications designated the United States of America must contain or be amended to contain a reference (amendment to the first line of the specification following the title or in an application data sheet (ADS)) to each such prior-filed application, identifying it by application number (consisting of the series code and serial number) or international application number and indicating the relationship of the applications. Cross references to other related applications may

- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant pending application was filed on 7 February, 2001, and was pending at the time of filing the instant petition. A reference to the above-noted, prior-filed nonprovisional application has been included in an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title which was filed concurrently with the instant petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3).

The reference to the above-noted, prior-filed nonprovisional application was not included in the manner specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) (i.e., in an ADS or in an amendment to the first sentence following the title of the specification) or filed within the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii).

A reference to add the above-noted, prior-filed application on page one following the first sentence of the specification has been included in an amendment filed on 25 November, 2003. As petitioners point out, the incorporation by reference of the prior application is not incorrect because the first line of the specification as filed on 7 February, 2001, incorporates by reference the prior application.

The instant nonprovisional application was filed after 29 November, 2000, and the claim herein for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional application is submitted after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). Also, the reference to the prior-filed nonprovisional application was submitted during the pendency of the instant nonprovisional application, for which the claim for benefit of priority is sought. Accordingly, having found that the instant petition for acceptance of an unintentionally delayed claim for the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 to the prior-filed nonprovisional application satisfies the conditions of 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), the petition is granted.

be made when appropriate (see § 1.14).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>See\_35 U.S.C. § 120.

The granting of the petition to accept the delayed benefit claim to the prior-filed application under 37 CFR 1.78(a) (3) should not be construed as meaning that the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed application. In order for the instant application to be entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed application, all other requirements under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a) (1) and (a) (2) must be met. Similarly, the fact that the corrected Filing Receipt accompanying this decision on petition includes the prior-filed application should not be construed as meaning that applicant is entitled to the claim for benefit of priority to the prior-filed application noted thereon. Accordingly, the examiner will, in due course, consider this benefit claim and determine whether the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date.

A corrected Filing Receipt, which includes the priority claim to the prior-filed nonprovisional application, accompanies this decision on petition.

Any inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Douglas I. Wood at 703-308-6918.

The application is being forwarded to Technology Center Art Unit 2672 for appropriate action on the amendment filed on 20 February, 2003, including consideration by the examiner of applicant's entitlement to claim benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 to the prior-filed nonprovisional application.

Charles A. Pearson

Director, Office of Petitions

Encl: Corrected Filing Receipt